

SPEAKER NICHOL: You have heard the closing statement and the question is, shall the bill be returned for a specific amendment? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 7 nays on the motion to return, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Okay, the bill is returned. Senator Scofield, now we are back on Select File.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Thank you. I don't think it is necessary for me to explain any further the intent of this. I think I did that. Unless anybody has questions, I would simply tell you that I think this will have significant meaning to the affected parties out there and I hope you will join me in adding this amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR BARRETT: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Scofield, just so I...did any members of the Legislature have a copy of this amendment? Has it been passed out?

SENATOR SCOFIELD: It was passed out.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Scofield, Section 2 of the amendment, what does that do, changing the date from '85 to '86?

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Senator Beutler, previously I mentioned to you that what I am trying to do is just to get this bill to conform with the new date that we set. I don't know that this date is all that important. What I think the effect of this may be would be to prevent a rush of property that is currently in a Class I to Class VI's, and I could give you a couple of examples that I think might possibly happen. In Sheridan County, for instance, there are three communities, Hay Springs, Rushville, and Gordon. Gordon happens to be a Class VI high school. It is about...I think about 12 miles from Rushville. I think it is likely that some of the affected Class I's would prefer to be in a Class VI and may rush over and join Gordon if Gordon will, in fact, take them. That erodes the tax base of Rushville. That is a grave concern of that community. We might see a similar